

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,511	03/29/2001	Don Rutledge Day	AUS920010001US1	5448
7590 07/28/2004			EXAMINER	
Duke W. Yee Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP P.O. Box 802334 Dallas, TX 75380			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/820,511	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Maikhanh Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
       Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
       Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/29/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application filed 03/29/2001; IDS filed 05/29/2001.

2. Claims 1-26 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 25 are independent claims.

**Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claims 1-4, 8-15, and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

**Guedalia** (U.S. 6,121,970 – issued 09/2000).

**As to independent claim 1**, Guedalia teaches method for magnifying a portion of a document in a browser (*Abstract*), comprising:

- presenting a first document in a first display in the browser (*receiving by the client computer from the server an HTML page; Abstract/col.4, lines 29-41/col.5, lines 52-53/col.8, lines 51-52*);
- presenting a magnified portion of the first document in a second display in the browser (*the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion*

Art Unit: 2176

*of the first image corresponding to the selected location, and sending by the server computer to the client computer the new HTML page; Abstract / col.13, lines 60-67 and col.17, lines 56-61);*

- receiving a request for an action within the second display; and performing the action with respect to the first document (*selecting by the user, using a pointing device, a location within the view window corresponding to one of the plurality of sub-regions, sending by the client computer to the server an indication of the sub-region selected by the user, modifying by the server computer the HTML page to generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image ... sending by the server computer to the client computer the new HTML page; Abstract and col.17, lines 40-63*).

**As to dependent claim 2,** Guedalia teaches the action comprises a selection of a link within the magnified portion and the step of performing the action comprises retrieving and displaying a second document corresponding to the link in the first display (*generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location ... sending by the server computer to the client computer the new HTML page; col.17, lines 56-63*).

**As to dependent claim 3,** Guedalia teaches generating a map between the magnified portion and the first document; and performing the action with respect to the first document based on the map (*generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; col.17, lines 56-61*).

Art Unit: 2176

**As to dependent claim 4**, Guedalia teaches mapping the magnified portion to the first document to form an imagemap (*image maps; col.3, lines 60-65/associating image portions with each of the sub-regions; col.4, lines 60-64 and col.14, lines 55-61*).

**As to independent claim 12**, it is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claims 13-15**, they include the same limitations as in claims 2-4, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to independent claim 8**, the rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, claim 8 recites receiving a selection of a portion of the first document.

Guedalia teaches receiving a selection of a portion of the first document (*an indication of the sub-region selected by the user ... sending by the server computer to the client the new HTML page; Abstract / receiving by the client computer a new HTML page from the server, in response to the sub-region which was selected; col.8, lines 46-60*).

**As to dependent claim 9**, it includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 10**, Guedalia teaches analyzing a document object model for the first document; and identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document (*selecting by the user a location within the view window corresponding to one of the sub-regions, and a receiver for receiving by the client computer a new HTML page from the server, in response to the sub-region which was selected; col.8, lines 46-60*).

Art Unit: 2176

**As to dependent claim 11**, Guedalia teaches adjusting attributes of nodes in the portion of the document object model based on a magnification factor (*col.16, lines 58-col.17, line 10*).

**As to independent claim 19**, it is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 20**, it includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claims 21-22**, they include the same limitations as in claims 10-11, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to independent claim 23**, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 24**, it includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to independent claim 25**, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 26**, it includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Guedalia** in view of **Aratani** (U.S. 6,121,970 – issued 09/2000).

**As to dependent claim 5**, Guedalia teaches creating the second display, wherein the second display has a magnified display space based on a magnification factor (*col. 13, line 64-col. 14, line 17*), and populating pixels in the second display to form a magnified display (*col. 14, line 62 – col. 15, line 10*), but does not explicitly teach “reading pixels from video memory for the magnified portion in a normal display space for the original document.”

Aratani teaches reading pixels from video memory for the magnified portion in a normal display space for the original document (*an HTML document formed on the assumption of being seen with a resolution of 1,024\*768 is read. The application program performs magnifying processing for all font data; col. 7, lines 41-61*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Aratani in the system of Moriya because Guedalia’s teaching would have provided the capability for efficient caching on both the client and server sides, so as to reduce network latency for the client and also boost server performance.

**As to dependent claim 6**, Guedalia teaches populating pixels in the second display comprises for each pixel of the normal display space, populating adjacent pixels based on the magnification factor (*col. 14, line 62-col. 15, line 10*).

**As to dependent claim 7**, Guedalia teaches mapping a magnified display space for the magnified portion to corresponding pixels in a normal display space for the original document (*The response image portion is magnified to fit the size of the full view window, giving the effect of a zoom-in; col. 14, lines 14-17 and col. 16, lines 39-54*).



As to dependent claims 16-18, they include the same limitations as in claims 5-7, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**Conclusion**

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Cline et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,721,851	issued: Feb. 24, 1998
Rogers et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,793,964	issued: Aug. 11, 1998
Van Hoff	U.S Patent No. 5,802,530	issued: Sep. 1, 1998
Canelones et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,700,589	issued: Mar. 2, 2004

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen  
July 23, 2004

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER